Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: JUNE 14 - 16, 1993

OKLAHOMA STATE REPORT

DECEMBER 6, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A - State of Oklahoma Exhibits

OKLAHOMA STATE REPORT
Site Visit June 14 - 16, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	Integrated Client Information System (ICIS)/Program System 2 (PS2)
Start Date:	1980
Completion Date:	1985
Contractor:	N/A
Transfer From:	N/A
Cost:	
Actual:	$1,683,465
Projected:	$1,440,829
FSP Share:	$725,989
FSP %:	43.1%
Number of Users:	2,087
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	IBM 3090-600E
Workstations:	Telex terminals, IBM clone PCs
Telecommunications Network:	T1 backbone; 56 KB copper lines to intelligent nodes; 19.2 KB lines to counties
System Profile:	
Programs:	Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, and General Assistance

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Oklahoma Department of Human Services (DHS) is the cabinet level agency designated as the State agency for the administration of the Food Stamp Program (FSP). There are three major groups within DHS: Administration, Programs, and Field Operations. Within Administration are Facilities & Control Services, Contracts and Purchasing, Human Resources, the Inspector General, and Data Services. The Data Services Division (DSD) is responsible for managing and operating the system that supports FSP (i.e., the Integrated Client Information System (ICIS)/Program System 2 (PS2)). Within Programs, there are Aging Services; Children, Youth & Family Services; Child Support Enforcement Services; Developmental Disabilities Services; Family Support Services; Medical Services; and Rehabilitation Services.

The Division of Family Support Services is responsible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Foster Care, Emergency Payments, FSP, Day Care Services, Health Related and Medical Services, Education, Training and Development, and Special Programs. There is also an administration and support component to Family Services.

The third major group within DHS is Field Operations, which oversees six area directors, who are responsible for managing field staff. They are assisted by six liaisons who set up training sites, times, and days. The six Area Directors report to the Associate Director of Field Operations.

There are 77 counties with 81 local DHS offices. The remote panhandle of Oklahoma poses supervision problems as it has a very small caseload and requires at least six hours of travel time to reach Oklahoma City.

In an effort to reduce costs and in keeping with reduced State budgets, there have been some organizational changes. Some middle managers were eliminated from Field Operations and Memorial Hospital is becoming a separate agency with its own Tandem computer. The Rehabilitation Services Agency will be separated from DHS and will also have its own computer, but will contract with Data Services for ongoing work.

The population of Oklahoma was 3,157,604 according to the 1990 census. In May 1992, FSP served 136,193 households and 348,321 individuals. This amounts to approximately 11 percent of Oklahoma's population.

Oklahoma's unemployment rate has been relatively stable in recent years. In 1986, the unemployment rate was at a 10-year high of 8.2 percent. Unemployment decreased each year between 1988 and 1990, reaching a 1990 rate of 5.6 percent, before rising slightly to 6.7 percent in 1991.

The October 1992 edition of *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Oklahoma's nominal expenditure growth for fiscal year (FY) 1993 was between 5.0 and 9.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.

- State government employment levels in Oklahoma increased by 0.2 percent. This change was in contrast to the national average, a 0.6 percent decrease.

- The regional outlook indicated that economic growth is positive in the Southwest region. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 7.9 percent was slightly higher than the national average of 7.8 percent, but this figure is skewed by the Texas jobless rate of 8.2 percent. The per capita regional personal income increase of 3.6 percent was more than the national average of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

FSP is currently supported by ICIS and the Case Information (CI) System. These systems were Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified in May 1985. The non-public assistance (NPA) portion of ICIS has been operational since March 1986. CI has been in operation for over 24 years. Although CI is being phased out, it continues to be used for data capture and transfer to the ICIS databases. ICIS is fully operational for emergency AFDC, NPA FSP, and Medicaid. The public assistance (PA) FSP; Aged, Blind, and Disabled; AFDC; Refugee Assistance; Services; and Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) Programs are partially integrated into ICIS and are in various stages of conversion and implementation. ICIS interfaces with Child Support Enforcement.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

All programs have experienced growth in their caseloads over the last five years. AFDC participation has increased over 28 percent, Foster Care over 50 percent, and Medicaid about 54 percent. FSP has had a more modest increase in caseload, 20 percent. Child Support Enforcement cases have declined by 54 percent from 1988 to 1992.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	46,435	42,732	40,910	36,333	36,088
Individuals	132,317	122,972	118,569	104,015	103,892
Foster Care	4,557	3,927	3,591	3,196	3,004
GA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP					
Households	136,193	118,556	105,973	101,354	108,926
Individuals	348,321	302,091	269,373	259,060	285,959
Medicaid	161,283	136,405	131,209	116,939	104,552
Child Support Enforcement	104,706	146,746	146,869	118,707	193,316

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 11.5:1 in 1988 to 14.3:1 in 1992.

Oklahoma's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.[1]

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$169.47	$159.61	$147.62	$130.05	$130.19

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Oklahoma's FSP administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.[2] The data indicate that total administrative costs increased each year from 1988 to 1991

[1] The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

[2] The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

and then decreased in 1992. It also shows that the average cost per household increased steadily until 1991, then fell to $11.87 in 1992.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$19,294,793	$20,072,168	$17,345,849	$16,018,196	$14,561,994
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$11.87	$14.28	$13.73	$13.10	$11.36

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

FSP systems typically have an impact on several program performance areas. This section examines the system impact on staffing, responsiveness to regulatory changes, error rates, and claims collection.

2.4.1 Staffing

There are approximately 68 registration workers, each of whom has a terminal for data entry. There are 1,659 social workers who take and certify applications. Most of these workers share a terminal and a telephone with other workers. There are 291 supervisors, who each have a terminal. In FSP only, there is one terminal per two employees. There are 68 county directors. Vocational rehabilitation and child welfare workers have their own personal computers (PC).

In March 1993, a reduction in force (RIF) took place in the field and at the central office. The Family Support Division was reduced from a staff of 140 to 82.

Smaller offices utilize generic workers, but in the larger offices in Tulsa and Oklahoma County, workers are program specific. The average caseload is close to 300 cases. Some workers are managing caseloads of 350 to 400 cases. Caseloads have increased from levels of 200 per worker in the past. Staffing levels have decreased but this decrease was due to the RIF, not to ICIS implementation.

In an attempt to maintain timeliness, the recertification period has been extended from three months to six months.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

As shown in Appendix A, Exhibit A-2.1, Oklahoma was able to implement all of the required regulatory provisions within the required timeframes. Of the fourteen provisions, six did not require any computer programming changes, and only three did not require changes in State policies. The most difficult changes to make were those related to two month benefit issuances.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Oklahoma's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has fluctuated somewhat between 1988 and 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	8.92	7.35	11.08	7.54	12.28

During 1987 and 1988 Oklahoma experienced very high error rates. This was attributed to inadequate oversight of field operations. Subsequently, more autonomy and responsibility has been given to Field Operations to monitor the performance of field offices and county operations.

The March 1993 RIF eliminated some field staff, some middle management in Field Operations, and middle management in other areas of the central office. It continues to be a challenge to provide the training and oversight needed to reduce error rates, as caseloads have continued to increase.

State management evaluations have been changed to focus on error prone counties. The Family Support Services Division works closely with Field Operations but is not responsible for any supervision of the field.

In the past, supervisors were required to authorize benefits for each case, but, with the reduction in staff, the State now utilizes a Case Action Review System (CARS) from which supervisors can draw a sample of cases to do supervisory reviews of cases.

2.4.4 Claims Collection

The amount of claims established and collected, as shown in Table 2.5, has been steadily improving over the last five years. All overpayments are handled by the Overpayment Unit. Field operations prepare a referral form that is sent to the Overpayments Unit for entry into ICIS. The unit prepares client notices and establishes claims. A separate system has been developed for this unit that interfaces with ICIS. The system sends out receipts

and monthly billings. The State is currently planning to implement Federal income tax refund offset for the coming year. No State tax refund offset is performed.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$1,663,549	$1,602,164	$1,258,852	$1,298,923	$1,662,121
Total Claims Collected	$924,368	$765,742	$704,665	$659,359	$723,550
As a % of Total Claims Established	55.6%	47.8%	56.0%	50.8%	43.5%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

Oklahoma received FAMIS certification for ICIS/CI in May 1985. Because ICIS is being developed in phases, it did not receive Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) approval of the non-PA FSP portion of ICIS until a year later.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

ICIS supports FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, and GA. It interfaces with the Child Support Enforcement System, which is a separate system.

The organization and assignment of workload within the local offices is at the discretion of each office although Oklahoma is State-administered. Some offices have both intake and maintenance workers; others do not separate these functions. The assignment of caseloads (not automatic) may be based on the difficulty of the case or the category of assistance. Some large offices in Tulsa may have some FSP-only or medical assistance-only caseworkers, along with generic caseworkers.

3.1 System Functionality

ICIS is a fully integrated system that serves all PA programs under DHS -- FSP, AFDC, Medicaid, etc. An input/turnaround document, referred to as the PS-2, is completed by the eligibility worker (EW) and keyed into the system by a data entry operator.

The average case document is five pages long. The average FSP case is three pages long -- approximately two people per page. In 1984 the State received approval from FNS for a demonstration of a simplified application process. The basic application is for AFDC benefits. If the client also wants food stamps, he or she checks a box on the form

indicating this. If this box is checked, an additional form that captures shelter, utilities, and medical costs, the extra information needed for FSP and Medicaid, must be filled out. This information is keyed in and FSP benefits are calculated based on the extra data elements. This addendum also applies for aged, blind, and disabled recipients desirous of obtaining Medicaid benefits.

Separate databases have been created for each of the assistance programs. There is a notices database that contains all computer-generated notices for day care, AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP. There is a benefits database with issuance amounts. There is one primary database for all the basic information for every case.

ICIS has a fast response time and features that are helpful to the workers. Every time a case is changed, however, a turnaround document is produced. This results in a few million turnaround documents each year. DSD would like to eliminate turnaround documents by using PCs for input and front end processing. This would reduce the number of turnaround documents to 200,000 to 300,000 per year and cut the distribution costs.

- ***Registration.*** An applicant completes the cover sheet of the application form (PS-1), entering in his or her Social Security Number (SSN), name, address, and the SSN and name of their spouse and possibly other household members. The client may have completed the entire application form at this time, but usually the client takes the application form home, returning with the completed form and the verifications needed at the time of the scheduled interview.

  At the time the client requests the application form and the PS-1 is completed, the local office receptionist enters in the SSN to see if the client already has a case number and, if so, in what county the case is located. If there is a previously existing FSP case, the same case number is used; if not, a case number is assigned by the system. The worker makes a note of any other State programs in which the client may be participating and writes the cross reference and client number on the PS-1 form. The 30-day standard of promptness in completing the application is initiated at the time of registration, even though the application may not have been completed by the client or the required verifications provided.

  Turnaround data entry forms and notices are automatically produced by the system during registration and these are printed at the local offices. Approximately 80 percent of the State is now able to print locally. By June 1994, the State expects that 100 percent of the field offices will be printing the turnaround documents. The turnaround documents are optional; the worker can request them, but they are not required to do so.

  Historical participation records are maintained on-line for five years.

  The completed application form is date stamped on the date it is received. If there is a case on the system for an individual, the worker initiates a request for a

transfer of the case. The first county must teleprocess the case to the new county and send it the folder.

Receptionists are provided with screening sheets which they can use to determine whether a client requires expedited processing. When the case has been established on the system, a PS-2 input document is generated by DSD and mailed to the individual county office that initiated the case. If the worker does not receive the PS-2 from DSD, a blank PS-2 can be completed.

Clients are no longer seen by the caseworker on a first-come, first-serve basis. An appointment is made by an appointment clerk within each county office. In the large metropolitan counties, the appointment clerk utilizes an automated scheduling system that has been placed on a microcomputer to keep track of caseworker schedules. The interview is scheduled within a specified number of days of the date of registration of application. The county supervisor assigns the cases to the caseworker.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Following the interview, the worker completes a turnaround document from which the data are entered into ICIS (or into CI, if it is a PA FSP case). Immediate on-line data edits are provided by the system. The system provides reminders to the worker that required information has not been received. It also reminds the worker of pending applications and reviews that are due or delinquent. The system provides background eligibility processing so that the worker can proceed with work on other cases.

  A worker can get more detail about an edit or an error message through help screens. In the near future, Oklahoma expects to have the manual on-line as well.

  Ongoing case management has some redundancy. For instance, address updates are not automatic for all address locations because there are separate databases for various programs. An address can be changed for FSP but would not be automatically changed for another program. A change is being made in the system that will notify the worker of the address change so that the worker can update the address wherever it is located. A major issue associated with this is data ownership and the need for multiple addresses to be used for different purposes and programs.

  The system requires supervisory benefit authorization for all newly applying cases as well as for all re-applying cases.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** The system performs the benefit calculations by determining the FSP net income and corresponding coupon amount. The system also prorates the initial month's benefits and deducts any recoupment amounts from the coupon amount.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** In December 1991, the Human Services Commission required that all clients with food stamp issuances over $149 receive an authorization-to-participate (ATP) card, effective February 1992. This dramatically increased the number of ATPs mailed to benefit recipients. ATPs for expedited issuance are generated manually, but these are very error prone. The State also issues coupons by direct mail.

  If coupons are undelivered and returned, the worker can request replacement benefits on-line. The system can provide an on-line display of the entire issuance history and will link the document number of the original and replacement issuance. The ATP is matched with the recipient's address and mailed in a window envelope. The system checks the address and adds any missing zip code information. For FSP recipients who also receive AFDC checks, a combined issuance of coupons and checks is made.

  Each county has to pay for the cost of issuance, including postage and computer time. A separate account is kept for the counties. Oklahoma County chose to contract out with the National Check Cashers. Other counties have contracted with the State to perform issuance.

  Oklahoma offers direct deposit for PA payments. DHS plans to develop an operational Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) system, but if Regulation E goes into effect, the State will not assume this liability.

  Redeemed ATPs (approximately 125,000 per month) are data entered by prisoners and an ATP tape is prepared for the reconciliation contractor who compares the tape to the Master Issuance File.

- ***Notices.*** The notice system is fully automated. The worker is not required to enter any additional information for notices. The system automatically sends notices based on the actions taken by the worker.

- ***Claims System.*** The recoupment system is a part of ICIS. It is used by the Overpayments Unit, which sends out monthly statements. The claims system is integrated with ICIS.

  The worker prepares a paper claim form which is referred for overpayment determination to the Overpayment Unit. The Overpayment Unit enters the cause of the overpayment in the system and whether fraud is suspected. The corrected benefit allotment amount is calculated by the system. Only the Overpayment Unit staff can override the system calculation, the worker cannot.

  The system tracks the claim status, subtracts the recoupment amount from the recipient's monthly benefit, and automatically creates a collection record once the claim has been established. The client notice is submitted by the EW on a paper

form. The system will generate a paper notice of the claim to the EW and the client.

- ***Computer Matching.*** Since the spring of 1993, DHS has been utilizing the Data Mover System to send and receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) information from Baltimore. If the request goes to Baltimore in the morning, a response is received the next day. Matching is conducted prior to initial certification as well as after certification. Only Child Support Enforcement staff have access to Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) information. Child Support Enforcement staff also conduct duplicate participation checks on neighboring State databases, although FSP does not. Discrepancies are reported in the form of on-line messages to the worker. Discrepancies can be reviewed in detail on-line.

  The system tracks the resolution of the discrepancies identified through matching. Although the worker can delete a message without performing the required activity, a record of the message shows when the message was deleted, which can be used by the supervisor in reviewing worker performance.

  Alerts. There are two screens that notify the worker that a message needs to be reviewed. The alerts help workers manage their caseloads by letting them know when a redetermination is due, the amount of days remaining before a notice needs to be sent, pending applications, etc. Alerts can be deleted either manually by the worker or automatically by the system when the appropriate action has been taken.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** There is no monthly reporting for FSP in Oklahoma.

- ***Report Generation.*** There are a variety of reports generated by the system that are frequently used for workload monitoring and management. The worker can review daily on-line reports listing outstanding work needing attention. The worker or the supervisor can target active cases by supervisor or worker, a useful tool for reallocating workloads. The caseworker action report has a year-to-date summary, so it can be used to prepare the FNS-366 report reflecting the number of applications, number of certifications, number of denials, and the percentage split between PA and non-PA FSP cases.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** FSP management indicated that ICIS makes it possible to pinpoint by worker, the terminal, location, and time of each transaction; worker fraud can be detected or traced more easily. The system also prevents duplicate client participation and tracks overpayments.

  An electronic mail box is available to all staff. A worker can use this to ask for help from headquarters. The electronic mail box is used to disseminate policy changes, memoranda, and informal communications statewide.

CI utilized IBM's Information Management System (IMS) and provided both on-line and batch processing. Different application forms were required for CI input and no on-line processing and updating were available to the worker. Redundant data entry was also required.

4.2 Justification for New System

The Advanced Planning Document (APD) for a redesigned database and data capture approach was submitted to FNS in December 1980. The objectives of the new system were to:

- Minimize duplicated input by workers

4.5 Project Management

APDs in Oklahoma are prepared by each program; hardware APDs are prepared by DSD. In the past, all APDs were prepared by DSD, but this approach was changed so that program personnel would feel more responsible for development efforts.

With regard to ICIS/CI, project management oversight for total system costs has been decentralized, with hardware costs associated with the project maintained separately from the costs associated with application development. Application development costs for CI, and subsequently for ICIS and its associated ongoing phased development and enhancements, are not monitored in totality by any one person or group (neither program nor Data Services personnel). Thus, a total cost of development does not exist, since the hardware APDs and costs are tracked separately from software development.

4.6 FSP Participation

FSP participation included one FSP policy person, one Child Welfare field person, one generic field worker, and one generic administrator during the planning, development, and implementation of ICIS. This group met on a daily basis and provided input and approval of deliverables.

4.7 MIS Participation

ICIS was developed in-house by the Oklahoma MIS. The project manager was from MIS and the project staff involved 10 to 15 MIS staff (including two systems analysts), depending on the phase of the project.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

At the time of the initial ICIS APD there was some concern on the part of the Federal agencies that Oklahoma, in developing its own system as opposed to transferring a system from another State, was not adopting the most cost effective automation methodology. The State was able to demonstrate that it had the technical expertise to develop a tailored system and, using the phased development methodology, could do so in a cost effective manner.

There were instances where the central processing unit (CPU) capacity was inadequate for development demands. Since Oklahoma had a two percent sales tax designated to fund its social services system, the State was able to acquire the hardware required to maintain system operability. This funding, however, has been eliminated and Oklahoma has serious concerns about the future of its PA systems.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Oklahoma developed ICIS in-house. When development began, there were few systems available for transfer. In addition, Oklahoma felt it had the technical capabilities to develop its own system. Today, with the availability of certified systems, Oklahoma would transfer a system; however at the time, it felt there was no choice but to develop an in-house system.

Oklahoma personnel participated in a Regional Task Force Meeting, with five other States from the southwest, organized by the FNS Regional Office in Dallas. This meeting provided an opportunity for an exchange of ideas and discussions of States' system requirements and capabilities. It was very useful to Oklahoma and generated some ideas related to conceptual system transfers.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the Oklahoma ICIS/CI System. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090-600E, 256 MB main memory, 512 MB extended memory (3 CPUs)
- **Disk:** Memorex 6880 - 96 MB, 6890 - 128 MB, Hitachi 7390, IBM 3480, 6380 Amdahl
- **Tape:** STK 4670 9-track, IBM 3480 cartridge drives
- **Printers:** IBM 3800 page printers, STK 5000 impact printer, 3262 impact printers
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** Telex terminals, multiple vendors with IBM clone microcomputers, i.e., Zenith, DTK, Memorex/Telex
- **Telecommunications Network:** T1 backbone from Oklahoma City to Tulsa, 56 KB copper lines to intelligent nodes with 19.2 lines to the counties and 2400 to 9600 baud lines to individual work areas.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment of ICIS/CI consists of several components. This section describes these components, which include the current operating system, maintenance

environment, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. This section also discusses the future of the system.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The IBM 3090-600E runs under MVS/ESA using FOCUS IMS/DC for data retrieval and ad hoc reports, JES2 for batch control, TSO for development, VSAM and IMS for database control, and DB2 for development. COBOL II is the standard language. Several BMC utilities and FILE-AID are used to monitor and control the database. The performance of the CPU and database is monitored using DEXAN/IMS 320, EPILOG/IMS 320, OMEGAMON/IMS, OMEGAMON/II for MVS, and RTA/IMS. Several Computer Associates software tools are used to facilitate development and monitor the system. These include LIBRARIAN, OPTIMIZER, TELON, XPEDITER, and CA-7 scheduler. Netview and several other products are used to monitor the network.

ICIS/CI is a collection of files that are sectioned by application and function. For example, the Notice function has its own database and registration has its own section in the main database. File organization is via VSAM or IMS, though some new development is tracked in DB2. The database is purged monthly or quarterly, depending on the section. Notice text is kept on-line for six months then is transferred to microfiche for seven years. Benefit history is kept for three years before it is purged to an offsite archive. Court hearings remain on-line for five years.

There is a combined case database that reflects the PS-2 form. This database consists of client data built for ICIS and is keyed by either SSN or case number. There are also benefit sections for all 62 possible benefits, authorization databases, and data exchange databases. Record size varies by function, from several hundred bytes to over 4,000 bytes per record. There are a significant number of redefined fields that are used for multiple purposes.

Oklahoma has over 400 transactions defined for its PA systems. Very few of these are on-line in the traditional sense. Almost all transactions generate a batch transaction that is governed by the batch initiator. Inquiry transactions are the exception. In this respect, the batch cycle runs 24 hours. No on-line input is received between 6 p.m. and 7 a.m., but the batch initiators run continuously.

Security is maintained by Computer Associates ACF2 and by built-in transaction security at the field level. Remote databases are accessed for inquiry only.

There is an uninterruptible power supply with battery backup. Disaster recovery is through a hot site in the Washington/Philadelphia area through a private contractor. It is tested semiannually.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

DSD provides all system support and data center services in support of ICIS. This group is responsible for the help desk and for assuring that all offices have properly working terminals and communications lines to the central host. The support staff includes programmers, analysts, network support personnel, operations staff, and management.

Documentation is supplied by LIBRARIAN software and includes documentation in the code itself. The original requirements remain the standard for response time and functional integration. ICIS is written in COBOL II which is largely generated by TELON from Pansophic Systems Inc.

Backup and maintenance are done nightly as necessary. Occasionally, file maintenance delays the availability of the on-line capability. If this occurs, or if month end occurs during the week, on-line capability is available for inquiry and new registrations and authorizations can take place, but no history or current files are available for update.

There has been a significant increase in the level of technical expertise necessary to support the Oklahoma systems because of new technology. DB2, COBOL II, and KIOSK front end, among other items, have contributed to the increased technical complexity. The State retains a qualified staff partially because other employment opportunities are limited but also because it provides modern equipment, challenging projects, and interesting applications. Higher job grades and salaries and increased opportunity for advancement would make the State even more competitive. Currently the State is just adequately supporting its PA systems. There are over 100 service requests in backlog and this number is growing.

Reports are generated on-line, i.e., through an on-line transaction, and results are often returned to the requestor on-line, but the report generation and processing is in the background, through the batch initiator. Oklahoma's goal is to have all report processing take place in this manner. The objective is to not stockpile any reports or transactions for the nightly batch cycle, but instead process all transaction on-line but not necessarily real time. A batch report distribution process is being evaluated.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Oklahoma's telecommunications take place over a State telephone network that is monitored via Netview. It consists of a 56 KB copper wire network, although fiber optic lines are in process for Oklahoma City and Tulsa. The 56 KB lines radiate and separate down to 9600 baud lines to most field offices. The entire State will eventually be all fiber optic lines.

Over two million transactions are processed daily through CICS. This may generate either a foreground series of transactions or a background series of transactions. This number does not include the FOCUS inquiry transactions; these transactions may or may not be significant depending on their complexity and timing.

6.2.4 System Performance

CPU utilization is a significant issue in Oklahoma. The 78 millions of instructions per second (MIPS) rating of the central processor is utilized at an average rate of 80 percent with peak utilization of over 100 percent. This affects response time, processor availability, and system reliability.

There are 337.5 gigabytes of direct access storage device (DASD) associated with the DHS system. More than 32 percent of this is for ICIS/CI. There is one 9-track tape for interface with the Federal agencies and other, less technologically sophisticated State agencies. The other 22 tape drives are cartridge tapes. These drives generate 56,000 tapes; 4,012 of these may be used in any one month's FSP processing cycle.

6.2.5 System Response

ICIS internal response time is 1.5 to 2 seconds. Oklahoma does not have a tool to measure end-to-end response time or individual transaction response time. CPU utilization during peak periods adversely affects response time but no measurements were available. Response time has varied in the past depending on the number and type of applications added to the system.

Response time is not pertinent for many transactions in Oklahoma since most transactions that are not inquiry go to batch initiators for processing in the background. Most large data input jobs are still done by data entry operators. Workers are limited to changes and inquiries.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime is occasionally caused by an unusually lengthy file maintenance process during the nightly run. This is not common, and often the on-line can be used to make inquiries and input new transactions but not to change transactions. This is not seen as critical in Oklahoma since few transactions outside of inquiry are actually real time.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Oklahoma has received approval from FNS to be an operational site for EBT. The pilot will be in Oklahoma City and will operate for a minimum of three months. The FNS Southwest Regional Office has the Request for Proposal (RFP) for approval. The APD was approved in December 1992.

Oklahoma staff talked to a number of States and vendors before preparing the APD and RFP. They spoke with Minnesota, New Mexico, and Maryland. Vendors who provided information included Trans First, Deluxe, Veriphone, and equipment vendors. The State also attended an FNS EBT training session in Dallas and two conferences that were held by Agency for Children and Families (ACF), the Financial Management Service of the Treasury Department, and FNS in Washington, D.C.

Oklahoma will be looking to the vendor to provide the software, equipment, training, wiring, card issuance, reconciliation, and settlement. The vendor is expected to use the Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) for retailer funds transfer.

In Oklahoma, two major grocery chains have point of sale equipment for the use of credit cards, not debit cards. There are also 400 independents who also have credit card point of sale systems. These stores will add debit card capability.

Oklahoma plans to implement an on-line system for FSP only. If Oklahoma has to assume the liability for Regulation E, it will not be able to implement EBT. Oklahoma has included this requirement (to assume Regulation E liability) into the RFP. Some vendors are eager to get into the EBT market and may be willing to assume this liability.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section of the report identifies the system development costs, operational costs, and the costs allocation methodologies of the Oklahoma DHS for ICIS, as it relates to FSP.

ICIS was first discussed in 1979 and 1980. It was designed to develop and integrate several independent family support systems supporting Oklahoma DHS. The two primary family support systems ICIS replaced were the CI System and SIS. These systems were based on 1970 era technology and had limited functionality. ICIS was developed out of a need for a more effective reporting and tracking tool. This integrated system supports FSP, Medicaid, and AFDC. The system became operational and was certified in May 1985. ICIS later became known as Program System 2 or PS2.

7.1 ICIS/PS2 Development Costs and Federal Funding

The initial ICIS/PS2 APD was submitted in December 1980 and projected system development and implementation costs to be $540,767.[3] The FSP share of ICIS/PS2 development was $264,976, or 49 percent, with a 75 percent Federal funding percentage (FFP) rate. The FSP share was based on current program case workload activity. The APD was approved fully by FNS in July 1981. The initial ICIS/PS2 development effort consisted of Phase I, reception and intake. Phase I began in April 1980 and ended in April 1981, at a total cost of $524,992.[4]

An APD was submitted in August 1983 for ICIS/PS2 additional funding for Phase II activities and to meet FAMIS certification requirements. Phase II activities entailed the development of eligibility and case information functions as well as retrospective budgeting for AFDC and FSP. Phase III consisted of FAMIS enhancements. Phase II

[3] ICIS December 1980 APD.

[4] ICIS Project Manager project history.

projected costs were estimated to be $900,062.[5] The FSP share was $450,051 (50 percent) with an FFP of 75 percent. The actual cost of ICIS development through June 1983 was $929,681, bringing total ICIS/PS2 development costs to that date to $1,454,673.[6] As of June 1983, Phase II activities were not fully completed and $228,792 projected remaining expenditures remained in the budget. Therefore, the estimated total development expenditures, i.e., actual and projected expenditures, for ICIS/PS2 amounted to $1,683,465. Phase III, FAMIS certification, costs were distributed exclusively to IV-A program support for which FNS provided no funding.

Retroactive ICIS/PS2 system development cost reimbursement was requested in an August 1984 APD. The retroactive cost adjustments were for enhanced funding originally approved at 50 percent which were later determined by Oklahoma to be eligible for 75 percent enhanced funding. The total retroactive reimbursement request of $626,676 was to be shared among FSP, IV-A, and Title XIX programs. The FSP portion was $156,669 (25 percent).[7]

After June 1983, actual ICIS/PS2 development costs were no longer tracked and are not currently available. Although ICIS became operational in 1985, enhancements are being made on a continuing basis. FNS funding shares of ICIS/PS2 enhancements are shown in Table 7.1, FNS Funding of ICIS/PS2 Enhancements (no enhancement funding was requested in 1988 and 1989).

Table 7.1 FNS Funding of ICIS/PS2 Enhancements[8]

Year	Total FSP Share	FFP Rate	FSP FFP
1985	$156,849	75%	$117,637
1986	$285,729	75%	$214,297
1987	$92,426	75%	$69,320
1990	$597,168	50%	$298,584
1991	$457,878	50%	$228,939
1992	$358,639	50%	$179,320
TOTAL	**$1,948,689**		**$1,108,097**

[5] ICIS August 1983 APD.

[6] ICIS Project Manager project history.

[7] FNS regional office correspondence 10/84.

[8] SF-269 75 and 50 percent ADP Development for corresponding years and FFPs.

DHS does not maintain ICIS/PS2 development costs by component.

7.2 Operational Costs

Operational costs for ICIS are not consolidated. Each program division, e.g., FSP, maintains operating cost information separately. Therefore, operating costs for ICIS/PS2 as a whole are not readily available. The FSP portion of ICIS/PS2 automated data processing (ADP) operations cost is shown in Table 7.2, ICIS/PS2 FSP Share of Operational Costs.

Table 7.2 ICIS/PS2 FSP Share of Operational Costs[9]

Year	FSP Share of ADP Operating Costs	FSP FFP Share
1981	$1,180,457	$590,228
1982	$1,798,703	$899,352
1983	$2,602,122	$1,301,061
1984	$2,816,408	$1,408,204
1985	$2,614,341	$1,307,170
1986	$3,205,156	$1,602,578
1987	$3,128,578	$1,564,289
1988	$2,607,643	$1,303,819
1989	$1,634,545	$817,273
1990	$2,282,194	$1,141,097
1991	$2,323,626	$1,161,813
1992	$2,579,372	$1,289,732

ADP operations are provided by DSD. ICIS/PS2 operating cost components consist of:

- ***DSD Administration.*** This cost component includes administrative personnel responsible for the overall management of the DSD unit. It also includes related, directly identifiable charges and DSD's share of State office administration costs.

[9] SF-269 ADP Operations for corresponding years.

- ***Electronic Data Processing Overhead.*** This cost component includes personnel responsible for overseeing all aspects of operations, operating systems, and equipment for electronic data processing (EDP) who are not directly related to a single unit of EDP. It also includes related, directly identifiable charges.

- ***Project Management System.*** This cost component includes personnel providing programming, data entry, control services, and other related, directly identifiable services.

- ***Central Processing Unit.*** This cost component includes the CPU and related personnel involved in operations and systems. It also includes all related equipment depreciation, rent, maintenance, software, and other directly identifiable charges.

- ***Tape Unit.*** This cost component includes all tape drives, directly related support personnel, and other directly identifiable charges.

- ***Disk Unit.*** This cost component includes all disk drives, directly related personnel, and other direct charges.

- ***Printer Unit.*** This cost component includes all printers and printer systems, directly related personnel, and other direct charges.

- ***Teleprocessing Unit.*** This cost component includes telecommunications control units, lines, direct personnel, and other direct charges in support of the teleprocessing (telecommunications) unit.

- ***Dedicated Equipment.*** This cost component includes terminals and printers at local and State offices. Costs for each type of device include maintenance, depreciation, and other relevant expenses.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on 1992 FSP operating costs of $2,579,364, monthly operating costs averaged $214,947 in 1992. The average number of FSP cases monthly was 136,193 households. The cost per case -- the monthly operational costs divided by the average number of monthly cases -- was $1.58.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

DSD provides ADP operations which support ICIS/PS2. DSD bills the DHS Office of Finance monthly for ADP operations, by program. DSD maintains a mainframe-based accounting system which tracks jobs by cost codes. Cost codes are associated activities (functions) which support specific programs, e.g., FSP. Programmers and analysts providing operation support code time sheets with cost codes. Additionally, the grant points system (discussed in the section 7.4.2) used to allocate costs is maintained by DSD.

DSD submits ADP operation bills to the DHS Office of Finance where cost allocation and funding request activities are performed.

7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodologies used by the Oklahoma DHS to allocate costs associated with ICIS/PS2. The cost allocation plans currently being used have been approved by FNS.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of Development Cost Allocation Methodology

The FNS share of ICIS/PS2 development costs was projected at 50 percent. ICIS/PS2 development cost were allocated based on the proportion of the program caseloads to total DHS caseloads. Documentation detailing how the cost allocation percentages were developed is unavailable.

7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

ICIS/PS2 operating expenditures are aggregated into nine cost centers or cost pools: DSD administration, EDP overhead, Project Management System, CPU, tape unit, disk unit, printer unit, teleprocessing unit, and dedicated equipment.

Costs are all identified directly to all cost pools. Costs that have been identified to EDP overhead are allocated to five cost centers based on salary and benefit distribution: CPU, tape, disk, printer, and teleprocessing.

DSD administration costs are allocated based on accumulated salaries and benefits to the above mentioned five cost centers. Charges are based on utilization by cost code. Utilization is identified to cost objective (program) using internal cost codes generated within each job.

Each quarter, beginning with the second quarter, the current quarter costs are added to the previous costs for the fiscal year and distributed based on the fiscal year to date utilization. Program charges are the difference between this allocation and the total fiscal year to date allocations.

The proportion of utilization by cost code is the basis of program charges. Cost center utilization measurement is shown in Table 7.3, Cost Center Utilization.

Cost coding consists of direct charge codes and prorated codes. Costs accumulated under the program cost codes are either charged directly to programs, charged to cost pools, or prorated by accounting.

FSP has two program cost codes, FSP eligibility and food stamp issuance. Codes are prorated among programs. A prorated code can have several cost codes associated with it. Costs accumulated under these codes are allocated to the program cost codes. The

prorated, or allocated cost codes, associated with FSP are shown in Table 7.4, FSP Related Allocated Cost Codes.

The grant point system used to allocate some of the ADP costs is based on the eligibility determination input documents. Each field in the document is assigned points relating to the program(s) which it is facilitating. Fields that are shared among programs are given equal weights. A ICIS/PS2 screen may support one or several programs.

Table 7.3 Cost Center Utilization[10]

Cost Center	Utilization Measurement
Project Management System	Time reported by individual is weighted according to the specific employee's salary and benefits.
Central Processing Unit	CPU time.
Tape Unit	Tape channel execution time.
Disk Unit	Megabytes of resident storage or I/O counts.
Printer Unit	Print lines.
Teleprocessing Unit	Utilization is measured for each device attached to the teleprocessing network. Utilization is divided into costs other than the extra line costs for remote devices to achieve the rate.
Dedicated Equipment	One-to-one basis for devices with each device sharing in an equivalent amount of all depreciation and maintenance of that device type.

[10] DHS Cost Allocation Plan.

Table 7.4 FSP Related Allocated Cost Codes[11]

Cost Code	Title	Proration/Allocation Basis
P210	IMS/DB2	Prior to all other proration, IMS system utilization is allocated to all other cost codes based upon their IMS/DB2 utilization.
P120	Case Information	Allocated to PA programs based upon system count of active cases with points assigned to programs based upon fields utilized.
P240	Integrated Case Information	Allocated to all PS/2 system programs. Based upon count of active cases with points assigned to program based upon fields utilized.
P251	Notice Data Base	Allocated based upon the program code for all current notices.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
2.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92 *	Y	N	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92 *	Y	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	Y	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89 *	Y	N	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Oklahoma
Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090 600E	IBM	Purchase	256 MB main memory, 512 MB extended memory
DISK			
6880/6890	Memorex	Purchase	96 MB/128 MB (1/1)
7390	Hitachi	Purchase	(10)
3480	IBM	Purchase	(10)
6380	Amdahl	Purchase	(1)
TAPE			
4570/4674	STK	Purchase	Controller/tape drive (1/1)
7980-3/7390-B2C	HDS	Purchase	Controller/storage device (3/10)
3480-A22/3480-B22	IBM	Purchase	Controller/tape drive (4/10)
PRINTERS			
3800	IBM	Purchase	Page (2)
5000	STK	Purchase	Line (1)
3262	IBM	Purchase	Impact (2)
FRONT ENDS			
FEPs	IBM	Purchase	3745 (1)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3270 type	various	Purchase	

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Oklahoma. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Oklahoma. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Oklahoma	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
1,506	63	4.2%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	28	44.4%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Oklahoma. The number of responses, however, is low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

Overall, respondents generally are satisfied with the computer system in Oklahoma. EWs think that the system provides acceptable system response time, availability, and accuracy. Most EWs feel that the system is easy to use for most functions; nevertheless, workers' responses indicate some problems with particular features of the system. Workers generally feel that the system positively influences job satisfaction. A large majority believes that the system is a great help, but half think the system sometimes or often adds stress to the job.

Since Oklahoma's current system has been operational since 1985, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	1	3.7
Good	21	77.8
Excellent	5	18.5

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	10	35.7
Good	18	64.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	25.0
Sometimes	16	57.1
Often	5	17.9

Responding EWs generally think that system response time is acceptable. More than 96 percent of the EWs believe that overall system response time is good or excellent, and the majority feels that response time during peak periods is good. Three quarters of the EWs, however, think that response time sometimes or often is too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	5	17.9
Often	23	82.1

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	32.1
Sometimes	17	60.7
Often	2	7.1

More than 82 percent of responding eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but nearly 68 percent of EWs also think that the system is sometimes or often down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	7.1
Good	24	85.7
Excellent	2	7.1

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	85.7
Sometimes	4	14.3

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	6	21.4

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	46.4
Sometimes	13	46.4
Often	2	7.1

The eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are quite accurate. Nearly 93 percent of the workers feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or excellent. Large majorities also feel that cases are rarely terminated in error and eligibility determination is usually accurate; however, more than 53 percent of the EWs feel that the system's data sometimes or often is obsolete.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	46.4
Sometimes	14	50.0
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	57.1
Sometimes	10	35.7
Often	2	7.1

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	82.6
Sometimes	4	17.4

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	88.9
Sometimes	3	11.1

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	76.5
Sometimes	4	23.5

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	18	64.3
Sometimes	10	35.7

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	5	17.9
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	88.0
Sometimes	2	8.0
Often	1	4.0

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	23	82.1
Sometimes	4	14.3
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	21	77.8
Sometimes	3	11.1
Often	3	11.1

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	7	41.2
Sometimes	6	35.3
Often	4	23.5

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	8	38.1
Sometimes	9	42.9
Often	4	19.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	82.1
Sometimes	4	14.3
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	64.3
Sometimes	9	32.1
Often	1	3.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	50.0
Sometimes	10	38.5
Often	3	11.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	10	40.0
Sometimes	12	48.0
Often	3	12.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	7	30.4
Sometimes	11	47.8
Often	5	21.7

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	23	88.5
Sometimes	2	7.7
Often	1	3.8

Eligibility workers' responses to these questions express the belief that the system is easy to use for many, but not all, functions for the majority of workers. Almost 54 percent of the EWs report sometimes or often having difficulty obtaining information from the system. More than half of the responding EWs sometimes or often have difficulty monitoring the status of hearings, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	7	25.0
Often	21	75.0

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	14	50.0
Sometimes	12	42.9
Often	2	7.1

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	85.7
Sometimes	4	14.3

Generally, EWs think that the system positively influences job satisfaction. Three quarters of the eligibility workers feel that the system is a great help in their jobs. Although 50 percent of the workers believe that the system sometimes or often contributes to job-related stress, nearly 86 percent believe that the system usually is more helpful than problematic.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	67.9
Sometimes	9	32.1

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	70.4
Sometimes	8	29.6

A significant majority of EWs feels that there are few problems associated with providing expedited service to clients.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Oklahoma system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Oklahoma's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX C

STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Oklahoma. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EW Supervisors in Oklahoma	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
266	30	11.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	11	36.7%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Oklahoma. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

Most EW supervisors in Oklahoma regard the system positively and believe that it helps them in their jobs. EW supervisors generally think that system response time, availability, and accuracy are acceptable. EW supervisors' responses suggest that the system is relatively easy to use for some functions, but there are a couple of areas in which significant proportions of EW supervisors believe there are problems. Most EW supervisors also feel that the system generally supports management needs and contributes to job satisfaction. Nevertheless, some respondents feel that the system adds stress and presents problems with certain management tasks.

Since Oklahoma's current system has been operational since 1985, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are

not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	27.3
Good	6	54.5
Excellent	2	18.2

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	72.7
Good	2	18.2
Excellent	1	9.1

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	18.2
Sometimes	8	72.7
Often	1	9.1

EW supervisors in Oklahoma are somewhat satisfied with system response time. Almost 73 percent of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, but the same proportion believes that response time is poor during peak

processing periods. A majority also thinks that response time sometimes or often is too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	1	9.1
Often	10	90.9

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	9.1
Sometimes	10	90.9

Almost 91 percent of EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it; however, most supervisors also feel that there are instances of downtime. This downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	9.1
Good	9	81.8
Excellent	1	9.1

EW supervisors generally perceive the quality of the system's data to be acceptable. Almost 91 percent of the supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	27.3
Sometimes	7	63.6
Often	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	27.3
Sometimes	7	63.6
Often	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	83.3
Often	1	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	70.0
Sometimes	3	30.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	50.0
Sometimes	3	50.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	70.0
Sometimes	2	20.0
Often	1	10.0

EW supervisors' responses suggest that the system is relatively easy to use for some functions, but there are some areas of difficulty. Most EW supervisors report rarely having difficulties terminating benefits for failure to file, generating notices, and restoring benefits. More than 72 percent of the supervisors, however, report sometimes or often having problems in the following areas: obtaining information from the system and learning to use the system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	3	27.3
Often	8	72.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	36.4
Sometimes	7	63.6

EW supervisors feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction, but some also think it adds stress. Nearly 73 percent of the respondents feel that the system often is a great help; however, a majority thinks the system sometimes creates added stress.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	27.3
Good	8	72.7

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	36.4
Good	6	54.5
Excellent	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	28.6
Sometimes	3	42.9
Often	2	28.6

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	20.0
Sometimes	3	60.0
Often	1	20.0

EW supervisors feel that the system supports management needs in some areas. Nearly 73 percent of the EW supervisors think that the quality of the reports produced by the system is good, and almost 64 percent feel that technical staff support is good or excellent. However, more than half of responding EW supervisors report sometimes or often having problems making mass changes or meeting Federal reporting requirements.

Table of Contents

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Oklahoma's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Oklahoma system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Oklahoma's system was

applicable.